



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/765,623

01/22/2001

Hiroyuki Kaneko

1095.1152/JDH

8796

21171 7590 06/04/2007
STAAS & HALSEY LLP
SUITE 700
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, QUANG N

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2141

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/04/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Application No. 09/765,623	Applicant(s) KANEKO, HIROYUKI	
	Examiner Quang N. Nguyen	Art Unit 2141	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 21 May 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
- (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
- (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
- The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
- Claim(s) allowed: None.
- Claim(s) objected to: None.
- Claim(s) rejected: 1-7.
- Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: None.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: see attachment.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____
13. ☐ Other: _____.


RUPAL DHARJA
 SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Detailed Action

1. This Office Action is in response to the Amendment filed on 10/19/2006. Claims 1-7 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. **Claims 1 and 6-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.**

4. Claims 1 and 6-7 recite the newly amended limitation *“providing, when a request, specifying a particular application program, is received from the logged-in user, along with both the user ID and password used by that user to log in, the received request to the specified application program according to the group and the using environment corresponding to the received user ID and password”*, which was not described in Fig. 9

Art Unit: 2141

and the corresponding specification (page 14, line 27 – page 16, line 8) in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Examiner respectfully submits that at step [S5] of Fig. 9, after the CPU determines that the user has already logged in to the server then the CPU skips steps [S7, S8 and S9] together and proceeds directly to step [S9], wherein the CPU performs an appropriate process corresponding to a request sent from the user. Both of the Fig. 9 and the corresponding specification (page 14, line 27 – page 16, line 8) do not appear to describe and/or support the newly amended limitation sufficiently. Hence, Examiner respectfully requests the Applicant to exactly point out the portion of the specification (with the pages and line numbers) and/or the drawings (with the steps) that supports the newly amended limitation as claimed in claims 1 and 6-7.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2141

6. **Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kurosawa et al. (US 6,047,288), hereinafter “Kurosawa”, in view of Cox et al. (US 6,510,466), hereinafter “Cox”.**

7. As to claim 1, **Kurosawa** teaches a system and method of group environment specifying and setting, comprising:

group specifying means for specifying, in the case of a predetermined user having logged in using a user ID and password, a group to which the user belongs (*group list 601a stores a group name and members of the group*) (**Kurosawa, Fig. 20, col. 12, lines 30-34 and col. 24, lines 35-42**);

using environment specifying means for specifying a using environment corresponding to the group specified by the group specifying means (*the environment setting information of a designated group is derived from the database*) (**Kurosawa, col. 13, lines 35-54**);

using environment setting means for setting an environment which conforms to the using environment specified by the using environment specifying means (*the environment setting information is derived and sent to the terminal to apply the environment setting*) (**Kurosawa, col. 14, line 55 – col. 15, line 16**); and

creating databases (*databases 601a and 601b as illustrated in Figs. 20-21*) according to group and designating one of the databases, which an application program uses (*the setting information in database 601b of Fig. 21 gives a default setting for a conferencing application*) (**Kurosawa, Figs. 20-21, col. 24, line 35 – col. 25, line 13**).

However, **Kurosawa** does not explicitly teach providing, when a request specifying a particular application program, is received from the logged-in user, along with both the user ID and password used by that user to log in, the received request to the specified application program according to the group and the using environment corresponding to the received user ID and password.

In an analogous art, **Cox** teaches a system and method for centralized management of application programs on a network, wherein an administrator may define and authorized certain users and/or groups of users to access appropriate applications installed on the server in the database 208, which acts as a central repository of application management information, such as user, software, device preference and access control information, responsive to client management server 204 (**Cox, col. 8, line 57 – col. 9, line 5**). **Cox** also teaches in Fig. 4, if a user identification and password information is contained in the request at block 234, user login operations are executed including bringing up a user desktop and establishing the user's credentials and application access authorization (**Cox, col. 12, lines 53-57**), and if it is determined that the request has been received from an already logged-in user at block 238 requesting execution of an application (as opposed to initial setup of a user desktop interface in the first time log-in), application access management operations are executed to bring up an instance of the managed/requested application for the user at block 240 (*i.e., after determining that the user has logged in, performing an appropriate process corresponding to a request sent from the user*) (**Cox, col. 12, line 61-67**).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of **Kurosawa** with the teachings of **Cox** to include providing the received request to the specified application program according to the user ID and password included in a packet of the request to establish the user's credentials and application access authorization (**Cox, col. 12, lines 53-57**). One would be motivated to do so to allow the system to provide login support for user authentication and mapping to a user profile and software support to configure the software (*applets and applications*) users and groups for access to and the user preferences for those software applications (**Cox, col. 10, lines 38-43**).

8. As to claim 2, **Kurosawa-Cox** teaches the system of claim 1, wherein the group comprises one or more users (**Kurosawa, Fig. 20**).

9. As to claim 3, **Kurosawa-Cox** teaches the system of claim 1, wherein the databases are divided physically or logically according to the groups (*databases 601a as illustrated in Fig. 20*), and the using environment setting means sets one of the databases corresponding to the group specified by the group specifying means (*the setting information in database 601b of Fig. 21 gives a default setting for a conferencing application*) (**Kurosawa, Figs. 20-21, col. 24, line 35 – col. 25, line 13**).

10. As to claim 4, **Kurosawa-Cox** teaches the system of claim 1, wherein the group specifying means comprises a table which associates user information regarding each

Art Unit: 2141

user with the group to which each user belongs (*for example, as illustrated in Fig. 20, USER1 belongs to group 3/C, USER2 and USER3 belong to group 2/B, etc.*) and specifies the appropriate group by referring to the user information, which user entered when the user logged in, and the table (**Kurosawa, Fig. 20, col. 24, lines 35-42**).

11. As to claim 5, **Kurosawa-Cox** teaches the system of claim 1, further comprising processing means for performing a process corresponding to a request from the user (*the environment setting information is derived and sent to the terminal to apply the environment setting*) (**Kurosawa, col. 14, line 55 – col. 15, line 16**), wherein the processing means performs a process in the environment for each group set by the using environment setting means (*for example, icon displays may be selected for inclusion in the desktop based on whether a particular user is an authorized user for the associated applications*) (**Cox, col. 9, line 58 – col. 10, line 2**).

12. Claim 6 is a corresponding computer-readable record medium claim of system claim 1; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale.

13. Claim 7 recites a method claim that contains similar limitations as system claim 1; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale.

Response to Arguments

14. In the Remarks, Applicant argued in substance that

(A) Prior Art does not teach or suggest *“providing, when a request, specifying a particular application program, is received from the logged-in user, along with both the user ID and password used by that user to log in, the received request to the specified application program according to the group and the using environment corresponding to the user ID and password”*, as recited in independent claims 1 and 6-7.

As to point (A), **Cox** teaches in Fig. 4 at block 234, if a user identification and password information is contained in the request, user login operations are executed including bringing up a user desktop and establishing the user's credentials and application access authorization (**Cox, col. 12, lines 53-57**), and **if it is determined that the request (along with the user ID and password) has been received from an already logged-in user at block 238 requesting execution of an application** (as opposed to initial setup of a user desktop interface if it is the first time log-in for the user), **application access management operations are executed to bring up an instance of the managed/requested application for the user at block 240** (*i.e., after determining that the user has logged in, performing an appropriate process corresponding to a request sent from the user*) (**Cox, col. 12, line 61-67**).

Hence, every request from the user is supposed to be accompanied by the user identification and password information, regardless of whether the user has already logged in to the server system 22, which is used to determine if the request has been received from a first time log-in user or from an already logged-in user so the server system 22 can perform appropriate actions such as to initiate setup of a user desktop interface for the first time log-in user or to bring up an instance of the managed/requested application for the user at block 240 of Fig. 4.


15. Applicant's arguments as well as request for reconsideration filed on 05/21/2007 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive.

Art Unit: 2141


16. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Quang N. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-3886.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's SPE, Rupal Dharia, can be reached at (571) 272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Quang N. Nguyen
Patent Examiner
AU - 2141



RUPAL DHARIA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER